[*Note.*—**An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]**

II.—ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE HON. SPEAKER.

(1) MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR.

MR. SPEAKER : I have to announce to the House the following messages received from the Governor of Madras, dated 28th September 1956 :—

" In pursuance of Article 207, clause (1), read with Article 199 (1) (*d*) of the Constitution of India, I, Sri Prakasa, Governor of Madras, hereby give my recommendation to the introduction in the Madras Legislative Assembly of the Madras Appropriation (No. 3) Bill 1956, and in pursuance of clause (3) of Article 207, I also recommend to that Assembly the consideration of the said Bill."

" In pursuance of Article 207, clause (1), read with Article 199 (1) (*d*) of the Constitution of India, I, Sri Prakasa, Governor of Madras, hereby give my recommendation to the introduction in the Madras Legislative Assembly of the Madras Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1956, and in pursuance of clause (3) of Article 207, I also recommend to that Assembly the consideration of the said Bill."

" In pursuance of Article 207, clause (1), read with Article 199 (1) (*d*) of the Constitution of India, I, Sri Prakasa, Governor of Madras, hereby give my recommendation to the introduction in the Madras Legislative Assembly of the Madras Appropriation (No. 5) Bill, 1956, and in pursuance of clause (3) of Article 207, I also recommend to that Assembly the consideration of the said Bill."

(2) MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL.

MR. SPEAKER : I have also to announce to the House the following message received from the Hon. Chairman, Legislative Council, dated 28th September 1956 :—

" In accordance with rule 130 of the Madras Council Rules, I transmit a copy of the Madras Cultivating Tenants (Payment of Fair Rent Bill) 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 4 of 1956), as passed and agreed to by the Council on the 28th September 1956 without any amendment and signed by me."

III.—STATEMENT UNDER RULE 40 *RE* ALLEGED REFUSAL OF LOAN APPLICATIONS IN UDAIYARPALAYAM TALUK, TIRUCHIRAPPALLI DISTRICT.

MR. SPEAKER : I have received notice under rule 40 from Sri K. R. Viswanathan that he desires to call the attention of the Hon. Minister for Revenue to a matter of urgent public importance, viz., refusal of loan applications in Udaiyarpalayam taluk, Tiruchirappalli district.

SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN : Sir, I rise to call the attention of the Hon. Minister for Revenue to a matter of urgent public importance, viz., the refusal of loan applications in Udaiyarpalayam taluk, Tiruchirappalli district.

About half the number of villages in this taluk come under the ex-zamindari area. Survey work in these taken-over villages has not yet been completed and the poor ryots there are facing great hardships in regard to obtaining Government loans such as takkavi, manure or seed loans. In the year 1952, the Revenue authorities 10–10 a.m. refused to sanction loans to the ryots of the estate villages on the security of their unsurveyed lands, but on representation from more than one Member in this House, the Government were pleased to instruct the Revenue authorities not to insist upon the survey of the lands given as security. Thereupon the ryots were granted loans without difficulty. Now quite recently the Board of Revenue has issued orders to the Collectors to the effect that no loan should be granted to the ryots on the security of unsurveyed lands. Every ryot is expected to get his land surveyed before his application is taken into consideration. As a result of this order, about 400 applications pending in the Taluk office were refused consideration. A poor ryot applying for a loan of about Rs. 500 and below has already got some formalities and difficulties to undergo before the loan is disbursed to him. The additional burden thrown upon him by the orders of the Board of Revenue prevents him from enjoying the benefits conferred on him by the Government. Apart from the money spent by the ryot, the unusual delay and anxiety caused to him in the process of obtaining the loan is intolerable. I, therefore, request that Government be pleased to issue immediate orders to the Board not to insist on the survey of lands at least in the case of loan applications of Rs. 500 and below so that the poor ryots may be enabled to take advantage of the benefits conferred on them by the Government. Thank you, Sir.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, as regards the allegation that loan applications in hundreds had been rejected on the ground that the lands offered as security were unsurveyed, the Collector has reported that out of 247 applications disposed of up to 31st March 1956, only 14 cases had been rejected on the ground alleged. The allegation therefore is not correct.

It has been the practice to accept only surveyed lands as security for takkavi loans as various difficulties would crop up later on if unsurveyed lands are accepted as security. If, unsurveyed lands are, however, offered as security, the applicants are required to get them surveyed at their cost before the loan is granted. The Board has issued certain instructions in its proceedings referred to in the notice regarding the acceptance of unsurveyed lands as security. The Board appears to have instructed the Collectors that, now that the Survey Parties are at work, if lands offered as security have been surveyed by the Survey Parties but the survey has not been finalised and in the interim period before the finalization of the survey, applications are made for the grant of loans on the security of such surveyed lands, it is not necessary to have the lands surveyed again at the cost of the applicants for the purpose of grant of loans just because the formalities under the Survey

and Boundaries Act have not been completed and that sketches for the fields offered as security might be obtained from the Survey Party concerned and the further formalities under the Survey and Boundaries Act observed by the Revenue Department and the survey finalized, so that the applicants for loans in such cases may get the benefit of not paying the cost of survey excepting the cost of demarcation. It will therefore be seen that Board's Proceedings in question only extended a concession to the ryots in the taken-over villages. The allegation of the hon. Member that a large number of loan applications had been rejected after the issue of the Board's Proceedings cannot therefore be correct. It is reported that at present survey has been completed in 23 villages out of 108 taken over in Udaiyarpalayam taluk. These 23 villages will be getting the concession referred to.

The question of relaxing the rules and permitting the acceptance of unsurveyed lands as security on the analogy of the procedure followed in the cyclone-affected areas is also separately under consideration.

IV.—EXPUNCTION OF SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN'S REMARKS ABOUT KATTA BOMMAN.

MR. SPEAKER : I have received a letter signed by seven hon. Members of this House requesting me to call upon the hon. Member for Pudukkottai to withdraw certain words used by him regarding Katta Bomman. I cannot direct the hon. Member for Pudukkottai to withdraw what he said under rule 227 of the Madras Assembly Rules. I can only order the expunction of those words which are regarded as offensive from the official report of the proceedings of this House, if they are defamatory, indecent, unparliamentary or undignified.

On the 26th September a question was put by an hon. Member as to whether the Government have made representations to the Union Government for the construction of an air base in Ramanathapuram district in the name of Katta Bomman, the idea being that his name as a great national hero should be perpetuated. The hon. Member for Pudukkottai in a supplementary question used words which were calculated to characterise Katta Bomman as a disreputable person, but he was careful to mention that he was stating it on reliable information. The words used in themselves may not be regarded as unparliamentary, but the question is whether in the context in which they were used they were unparliamentary. There is no doubt that Katta Bomman is esteemed as a great hero by a large section of the people of this State. That the sentiments and feelings, the pride and the patriotism of some of the members have been stirred is clear from the letter that I have received. It may be that the hon. Member for Pudukkottai could with impunity use these expression in a public platform or in the press, but the question is whether they could be regarded as unparliamentary in